

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

*The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth.*

VOL. 8.

NEW-YORK, AUGUST, 1853.

NO. 4.

S. R. KIRBY, M.D., EDITOR.

## HAHNEMANN'S LATEST PREPARATIONS.

MY DEAR LUTHER,—Your questions respecting the exact meaning of certain figures which you find in Hahnemann's "cases," as communicated by him to Benninghausen, makes it incumbent on me to enter on the subject of his later preparations of medicines rather more fully than you perhaps bargained for; but I am persuaded you would wish to possess as correct an account of those preparations as we are now able to get.

I need not tell one who was so well acquainted with that great man as you were, that his invariable habit was to make one piece of knowledge when acquired merely a stepping-stone to another. He did not rest satisfied, even to the last moment of his life, with what he already knew, but was incessantly occupied in making new experiments for the purpose of acquiring new facts, and to facilitating the practice of Homœopathy.

In the progress of the cure of chronic diseases, conducted on proper scientific principles, it usually (or perhaps, when the treatment has been correct, invariably) happens that at some period or other of the case an aggravation occurs, to speak more correctly, a crisis; this was sometimes attended with many distressing symptoms. And, besides this, Hahnemann resided, as you know, during the later years of his life, in Paris; and in that (as I suppose in all other large cities) the nervous irritability of patients is often so excessive as to render it difficult to give homœopathic medicines in such doses as not to produce much suffering. Hahnemann had observed all this, and endeavored to find some means of administering remedies in such a way that the least possible disturbance compatible with cure should result. To this end he made a great variety of experiments. The first in order was I believe that to which you allude, viz., olfaction, and this he adopted in certain cases to the end of his life; at least I am not aware that he ever altogether abandoned it. But there exist certain objections to it in many instances; indeed, it is only where the nervous susceptibility is very much exaggerated that it is sufficient, even when the medicine is most accurately chosen,

to bring about cure. He was therefore driven to search for some other means of moderating medicinal action. His next experiment was, as you know, to dissolve three, two, or one globule in a glass of water, and then, after carefully stirring, to put a dessert or teaspoonful of this into another glass. He still found, however, that, in very many delicate constitutions too much excitement was produced even thus, when the medicine was accurately chosen; for, if a medicine is not exactly harmonic to the case, its effects are of course much less, inasmuch as it in that case acts on a part of the organism not morbidly excited; and this remark will explain, by the way, why so many practisers of the modern or "improved homœopathy" experience so few cases of aggravation, that is, because they give medicines at random, and so do not touch the disturbed nerves at all. The attenuation was, as you are aware, carried sometimes through two, three, four, five, and six tumblers; but it was a very inconvenient proceeding, and it had none of that simplicity which Nature's laws generally have. He tried, in its order, the diminution of the number of shakes, but that seemed not to give the accurate result that he wanted. He tried many plans, therefore, and made many experiments, with one or two of which I am acquainted, and others I have forgotten, if ever I heard them.\* The last, however, and that which gave the most satisfactory results (indeed I believe I may say that he was perfectly satisfied with them), was the plan I will now explain to you. Starting from the first spirituous tincture of any medicine, which I believe was the third from the commencement, and is, according to the ordinary notation, written I., instead of adding one drop of this dynamization to 100 drops of spirit of wine, to make the next, and so continuing the dynamization by drops, he moistened a few globules of a fixed normal size with it, and tak-

\* I was informed at the time that one of these experiments ended in making the resulting preparation much more active instead of less active. As well as I recollect, this was made by adding to No. I., before it was used for homœotizing globules, a drop of No. II., and so on (I am speaking, of course, of the old preparations); but I have never had any opportunity of verifying this.

ing (in the first experiments, I believe, ten, but in the latter and more satisfactory ones only) one globule of those so moistened, he dissolved that in a minute drop of water, and then added 100 drops of spirit of wine. Having shaken it (I forget how much), he moistened globules with this, and having dried them, put them into a tube in his medicine-chest, well corked; these he labelled  $\frac{o}{2}$ . The next dynamization was procured by dissolving one globule of  $\frac{o}{2}$  in a small drop of water, and adding 100 drops of spirit of wine; with this he humected globules as before, and called that dynamization  $\frac{o}{2}$ . This proceeding was thus carried on until the tenth, which was labelled  $\frac{o}{10}$  (originally, I think, he used the Roman characters, and called them  $\frac{o}{x}$ ,  $\frac{o}{v}$ , &c., but afterwards adhered, for these preparations, to the Arabic cyphers). The preparations so made were called *médicaments au globule* (which is the meaning of the *o*), to distinguish them from the old ones, which are marked with a small cross (X), and called *médicaments à la goutte*. He was so entirely satisfied with the gentle and kindly actions of these preparations, that they would, I think, have almost superseded with him all other preparations. I possess many of the medicines so prepared for him; most of them are complete series from  $\frac{o}{1}$  to  $\frac{o}{10}$ . I do not recollect that any were carried beyond 10, unless it be *Phosphorus*, of which, I think, he made up to  $\frac{o}{15}$ .

I have thus given you as accurate an account as it is in my power to give of Hahnemann's later preparations. I have used them for many years, with the most delicious results, in all cases of great nervous irritability; but as my patients are for the most part poor agricultural laborers, their wives or children, I find the old preparations quite as good for my purposes. But I really do believe that a more blessed and comforting preparation never was made by the hands of man for all nervous and susceptible people than these later preparations of Hahnemann. To this already long letter I must add a few more words. I BELIEVE the account here given is quite accurate, or nearly so. But many years have elapsed since it was communicated to me in confidence, and you must recollect that to me Hahnemann confided only the preparation of his globules (most of which I made myself for him); my health was not good enough then to enable me to resist the action of medicines while being prepared. It was another friend who prepared all these dynamizations. I hope I have made no error at all in this statement, but it never occurred to me then to write down the manner of preparing them. And if you ask me why I trusted to memory on such a subject, I can only say that Hahne-

mann had so often told me that the new edition of the *Organon* would contain the whole account of that and many other most valuable discoveries, (and I knew that that edition was ready, because Hahnemann himself had intrusted to me to negotiate with a bookseller of Paris the publication of it) that I never deemed it possible the world would ever have to lament the non-appearance of that which I believe in my heart would be the most valuable book, next to the Bible, that ever appeared in this world. Would only that it were in my power to persuade the lady in whose possession that work still is, and from whom I have never received anything but the greatest possible kindness, to put the world in possession of it.

One question more you may ask me, and that is, why I never published this account! The answer is simple enough. Like many other things, it was communicated to me in confidence, and I did not wish to intrude my "recollections" about such a matter, when we all were expecting every day would see the new edition of the *Organon* in print. Such recollections must be devoid of such certainty and authority as could be wished. Besides, to say the truth, I desired to let Hahnemann tell his own story, and not to let the miserable glimmer of my farthing candle trouble in any way the lustre of his glorious splendor.

*Dis aliter visum!* and it breaks my heart to think of it.

You can make what use you please of this hastily-written letter. I have kept silence for many years, but there is a time when silence becomes a crime.

Believe me, my dear Luther,  
Very faithfully yours,  
THOS. R. EVEREST.

Wickwar Rectory,  
Dec. 27, 1852.

#### HAHNEMANN'S LATEST PREPARATIONS.

To the Editor of the *Homœopathic Times*.

SIR,—Hahnemann's latest method of preparing homœopathic medicines, as detailed by Mr. Everest in his interesting letter, is calculated to prove highly important, in a practical point of view, both as diminishing the very serious trouble of the ordinary mode, and bringing us nearer to that which Hahnemann had been striving after for half an century, viz., gentle and yet penetrating action of our medicines. Well-informed and careful homœopathic practitioners will agree with me, that one of the greatest difficulties we have to struggle against in practice is the want of uniform smoothness in the action of our ordinary preparations. That great desideratum has never been attained. Hahne-

mann and the reflecting portion of his disciples have tried all kinds of expedients, but almost in vain. The action of the "high" preparations is extremely uncertain, frequently most violent, sometimes very smooth and gentle, at others they are apparently quite inefficacious, even when chosen with the utmost care. We have no criterion to lead us in their application. "Low" preparations offer very nearly the same uncertainty; and after long and extensive trials, I have found the old "middle" preparations, viz., from 6 to 60, to act on the whole more smoothly than any other hitherto tried. Under these circumstances the preparation from "tumbler to tumbler" was a great step forward, and I have been in the habit of resorting to it for more than ten years (particularly for the purpose of gently keeping up the action of a medicine through repetition) with very satisfactory results. Yet this process, though very simple, is not sufficiently so, to intrust the great mass of patients with it, and is, besides, calculated to expose Homœopathy to additional sneers and distrust among the public,—a thing which at all times should be strenuously avoided, if it can be done without detriment to the Cause.

Having myself tried, without thoroughly satisfactory results, various methods in order to obviate the frequently jagged action of our medicines, I heartily welcomed the communication which Mr. Everest made to me about Hahnemann's latest preparations, and lost no time in putting them to the test of experiment. Considering the manner in which Homœopathy is handled now-a-days by a large proportion of its professional adherents, it is not likely that this method will meet with anything but displeasure, if not reprobation, as increasing instead of diminishing the distance between allopathy and Hahnemann's system. This, however, ought not to influence those among the homœopathic profession whose main criteria in experimental science are experiment and observation, and who neither bend to the fancies of the *ignavum vulgus*, nor are swayed by preconceived notions, offhand assertions without proof, crude observations, and the various expedients of ignorance and indolence.

Many practitioners, however, may be glad to hear of some cases in which the efficacy of these preparations becomes pretty clear. The result of my experience since I have operated with them is this:—1. They offer a greater degree of uniform smoothness of action than any others known. 2. They not only act well in highly excitable and susceptible patients, but appear applicable to all degrees of susceptibility. 3. They act much better when changed occasionally with other homœopathic preparations—high, middle, or low—than when continued exclusively for some time, and so do the latter when changed with the former. 4. They seem

not to produce, to any degree, those medicinal disturbances by which the ordinary preparations are so apt to complicate the disorder, and render its correct treatment very difficult and troublesome. 5. There is no necessity for beginning globule-preparations from the 3d only; indeed, with triturations it would be inconvenient to begin from any lower than the 5th, for obvious reasons. I have in some instances begun from the 12th, the 30th, and others, and there is no valid *a priori* reason why the process may not begin at any higher degree of preparation; but this would interfere with one advantage which this method offers, viz., saving of time and labor.

Among a considerable number of cases I find about twenty, in which the efficacy of these preparations cannot be doubted by anybody accustomed to observe the action of our medicines in disease. Not wishing to trespass too much on your space, I shall only mention one or two at present, but shall, with your permission, forward others for the next few numbers of the *Homœopathic Times*. I only beg leave to say that the main object being to show the efficacy of the globule-preparations, there is no necessity for fully reporting cases which, for the most part, offer no other interest.

*Case 1.* An infant, eleven months old, had been suffering five or six days from the ordinary phenomena of teething; but as I always try to avoid giving homœopathic medicines in slight intercurrent acute attacks, whenever it is compatible with the interest of the patient, the child was not interfered with medicinally for that period. Gradually, however, the nights became exceedingly restless; the gums very hot and tumefied; salivation profuse; great apparent weakness; the child would not leave the nurse's arm night or day; left cheek very red; perspiration about the head; total loss of appetite; eagerness for cold water; frequent green stools, with crying before and during the evacuation; anus red and excoriated; urine scanty. The child took *Chomomilla* 9, one globule dissolved in six teaspoonfuls of water, one teaspoonful about ten in the morning. Two hours afterwards the little patient took his food very readily; after an evacuation of a perfectly natural color, became considerably more quiet, and was in every respect evidently improving fast; he had an excellent night, &c. Under these circumstances no more medicine was administered, still there was no appearance of a tooth yet; it showed itself about a week afterwards, seemingly without any trouble or pain. *Chamomilla* had taken away that which was morbid in the process. *Chamomilla* and *Coffea*, similarly prepared, have been given to the same child twice or three times since with equally good results. To me the efficacy of the preparations was not doubtful.

*Case 2.* A gentleman, sixty-five years old, a captain in the navy, who had taken a great deal of *Mercury* in hot climates, had the misfortune, whilst in America some years ago, to have the bones of the lower part of the right leg crushed by its being caught in the spokes of a carriage-wheel in motion. Amputation was proposed as inevitable; he, however, preferred his chance without it, and eventually kept his leg, rather deformed it is true, but still a leg. From time to time the separation of necrotic pieces of bone, and consequent inflammation and suppuration of the soft parts, has taken place. Within the last twelve months there had been a fistulous ulcer in connection with a focus of suppuration in the tibia, very painful, discharging considerably, and attended with erysipelatous inflammation. Without being decidedly ill, the patient suffered from constant physical and mental *malaise*, and considerable weakness. Some of the most eminent surgeons of the metropolis were repeatedly consulted; their opinions were divided; some advocating amputation as the only means of saving the patient, others objecting to it, on account of his age and weakness. He finally resolved upon trying homœopathy. I gave him, in the beginning of February, *Calcar. phosph.*  $\frac{9}{8}$ , one globule in fifteen tablespoonfuls of water, a tablespoonful to be taken morning and evening. No change of diet. Saw him again a week afterwards, and found that a most satisfactory improvement had taken place. The pains were considerably abated, the inflammation of the integuments had disappeared, the aperture of the ulcer was reduced to little more than the width of a large pin's head, and only prevented from closing by the patient putting in a piece of twisted cotton, as he thought he ought not to let it close suddenly. He was in excellent spirits, and his complexion considerably more healthy than before. The patient is not cured yet, but walks about and is merry. To anybody accustomed to such cases, the *propter hoc* could not be doubtful. In this case I found it expedient, from time to time, to change the new preparations for the ordinary ones; beyond this, the subsequent treatment offers no particular interest.

Instead of continuing my cases at present, I would beg leave to make a proposition to the homœopathic profession, which may be the more opportune just now, as many homœopaths will meet at the Congress in Manchester. It is this. We all know that the sixth edition of the *Organon*, which is ready in manuscript, contains improvements of the highest importance for the successful practice of Homœopathy. The non-appearance of the book keeps all those who are anxious for progress in the right direction in a most trying state of uncertainty and suspense. Under these circumstances, I think

it would be very desirable that the homœopaths of Great Britain, and perhaps those of the United States together, should sign an application to the lady in whose possession the manuscript is at present, for the purpose of inducing her to publish the *Organon*, either in French, German, or English, or simultaneously in the three languages. Knowing Madame Hahnemann as I do, I should be much surprised if she did not kindly yield to the application. The Manchester Congress might draw up such a document, sign it, and collect the signatures of others. To give it additional weight, the names of non-professional friends of Homœopathy might also be received.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

CHARLES LUTHER.

Southwick Crescent, Hyde Park,

Aug. 1, 1853.

#### HAHNEMANN'S LATEST PREPARATIONS.

*To the Editor of the Homœopathic Times.*

SIR,—In continuing the series of cases which I began in your last number, I beg leave to repeat, that as my only object is to afford proofs of the efficacy of Hahnemann's latest preparations, the reports are only sufficiently explicit to answer that purpose.

*Case 3.* Mrs. E. W., a person about fifty years of age, whose catamenia return at long but uncertain intervals, is subject, ever since the menstrual functions have become irregular, to violent "bilious attacks," as she calls them. On the 30th of May she had the following symptoms:—Sensation of coldness all through her, accompanied with faintness; pale, bluish-yellow complexion; face expressive of extreme languor and *malaise*; tongue thickly coated with yellow mucus; incessant thirst; dryness of mouth; total loss of appetite; bitter taste; nausea; diarrhœa; utter prostration of strength; excessively "nervous"; low-spirited; disinclination to speak. *Arsenicum* and *Veratrum* seemed to be clearly indicated. I gave *Arsenicum* 12, a couple of globules, in twelve tablespoonfuls of water, a tablespoonful every four hours; to cease taking the medicine in case of decided improvement. I allowed cold water *ad libitum*, and light mutton-broth, if needed. Expecting to find her quite well the next morning, I was surprised that, with the exception of a decrease of the diarrhœa, there was no improvement whatever. I then gave *Veratrum*  $\frac{9}{8}$ , in eight tablespoonfuls of water, every four hours a tablespoonful, with the caution mentioned. Next morning she was a "little better," but not much. I confess I was disappointed. I now decided upon *Lachesis*  $\frac{9}{8}$ ,



one globule, in eight tablespoonfuls of water, a tablespoonful every four hours as above. When I saw her the following day the change was quite wonderful. "Immediately on taking the first spoonful," said the patient, "I felt a pleasant sensation go all through me, and from that moment I began to mend." She took only one spoonful, and was quite well again when I saw her.

This case, besides showing the efficacy of the globule-preparations, may convey a lesson to those who dispute so fiercely about macro- and microdosism. In the first place it may teach modesty, in so far as it confirms what all conscientious and pains-taking homœopaths are long convinced of, viz., that frequently a medicine which appears quite appropriate for a given case, turns out not to be the right one. This can, in a great measure, be accounted for, but it would lead me too far to dwell upon the subject at present. If this frequently happens to those who are well acquainted with Homœopathy, and bestow the utmost care upon the selection of the medicine, assuredly those off-hand practitioners, who distribute globules and drops as they pass smilingly along, and think nothing of treating 254 patients "in a long day," need not make a show of offended dignity if incorrect choice of the remedy is sometimes hinted at by others as the cause of their non-success. *Correct choice of the medicine is the most difficult, nice, and laborious task, as it is the point upon which nearly everything in Homœopathy turns.*

The case also implies another useful hint, viz., if the medicine is thoroughly well chosen, as *Lachenis* was in this instance, the "smallest" dose will act promptly and powerfully. In such a case the dynamic affinity between disease and remedy is very likely analogous to that of certain chemical substances, and as a close affinity between two of the latter, when properly brought into contact, leads speedily to the production of a new body, so probably does close dynamic affinity between the two efficient—remedy and disease—if properly brought to bear upon one another, result in a short time in a *tertium quid*—improved health. Although I consider "smallest" doses, on the whole, as the best, I am far from saying that they alone act thus beneficially; on the contrary, I hold, that if we had intuitive faculties strong enough clearly to distinguish all the nice data in the disease and the remedy which may influence the right preparation and dose, we would probably find that, for the purposes of perfect homœopathic treatment, a variety of both is required. Hahnemann was, through intuitive tact and intimate acquaintance with his *Materia Medica*, a master in the art of choosing a medicine, and none of his disciples have ever equalled him. He therefore was most successful with "very small" doses, and hence insists upon the latter being always given;

but he has not pointed out in terms sufficiently incisive for many of his disciples the excessive difficulty and vital importance of correct choice. This want of appreciation of the difficulties of choosing the right medicine is the *fons et origo* of our angry disputes about dilutions and doses, and the radical mistake of the disputants lies in imputing non-success to the "smallness" of the dose rather than to incorrect choice. The proof of this assertion could be very easily furnished by the great mass of cases which are published in our literature. Long experience has produced in me the conviction, that if a medicine is given for curative and not palliative purposes, in any preparation from the 5th upwards, without beneficial result, I have been mistaken in the choice.

*Case 4.* Miss A. P., aged sixteen, menstruated since the age of fourteen, had always enjoyed good health till she came from the country to London. There her catamenia had not appeared for two months, and she suffered from distressing flushing, headache, and sensation of fulness in the head, want of appetite, and inclination to diarrhoea. She was low-spirited and silent, otherwise in good health. On the 15th of January I gave her *Pulsatilla*  $\frac{g}{i}$ , one globule, in twenty tablespoonfuls of water, every morning a tablespoonful. The night after taking the first dose, her catamenia appeared, and in a few days all other symptoms vanished. She took no more medicine, and has continued perfectly regular since.

*Case 5.* Mrs. N., aged thirty-two, had been suffering from headaches for many years, indeed she considers them hereditary. In other respects her health had always been good. Since her marriage, however, and particularly since the birth of her first child, five or six years ago, additional symptoms had gradually appeared. Allopathy had been tried under the best metropolitan and provincial authorities, but without any beneficial result whatever. Having been advised to try Homœopathy, she, like, a sensible person, read some of our popular explanations of the system, and became thoroughly convinced of its truth. She put herself immediately under the care of a homœopathic practitioner, but her symptoms increased so rapidly, both in number and intensity, under his treatment, that after five or six months Homœopathy was given up in despair. This practitioner was one of those wise men who look upon Hahnemann's doses as farcical, and merely calculated to increase the distance between Homœopathy and good old Allopathy, and who seemed to have worked themselves, if we judge from a great proportion of the cases published, into such a degree of intellectual blindness, that they do not perceive the artificial complications which they produce by unwarrantably large doses of medicine, given very much at random.

Under these circumstances, the water-cure was advised, and tried with partial benefit, which appeared to me rather a decrease of the results of homœopathic mistreatment than improvement of the original disorder. The conviction of the truth of Homœopathy remained unshaken, and the latter was again resorted to. On the 9th of December, 1852, the following were her leading symptoms:—Awakes in the morning, with sensation of fulness in forehead; on suddenly rising, violent vertigo; whilst dressing, pulsative pains in forehead, with uncomfortable feeling of heat and swelling of face. These symptoms diminish during a walk in the open air before breakfast; the latter takes them away almost entirely. Redness of face, resembling *acne rosacea*; feeling of tension in face and scalp; intense heat of face after washing it, or after dinner towards evening. Little appetite; considerable thirst; desire for acidulous refreshing drinks; nausea after meals; sometimes violent twisting pain in stomach. Abdomen exceedingly sensitive to pressure, particularly in the right ovarian region, as if from a sore. Costiveness; urine thick and of very unpleasant smell. Sometimes sudden loss of voice, without any apparent cause. Catamenia rather too frequent, not profuse, sometimes intermittent; a few days before, almost all her principal symptoms are increased; breathing short, and violent palpitation when walking up stairs; strength not much impaired; spirits generally depressed; sometimes uncontrollable fits of crying, besides many minor symptoms much too numerous to be mentioned here. To say, from this jumble of symptoms, what was original and what medicinal disease, was impossible, and nearly as impossible to hold out much hope of cure.

Her husband being strong, healthy, and willing, I asked him, before venturing upon giving any medicine, to mesmerise the patient gently from the head to the feet three times a week for ten minutes, and to report in a month. During the first fortnight the effect seemed to be very satisfactory. Her headache diminished; her spirits improved; she felt altogether more comfortable, and thought herself on the high road to health; gradually, however, the old symptoms came back, and seemed to remain stationary. I gave now, in slow succession, *Sepia*, *Calcarea*, *Sulphur*, *Arsenicum*, *Kreosot.*, and *Lachesia*, in various preparations, some with partial, some without any good results whatever, and I felt that none of these medicines acted as homœopathic medicines do act where they possess a close curative affinity to the disorder. On the 8th of May, I sent two powders of *Graphites*  $\frac{g}{2}$ , one globule in each, to be put into seven tablespoonfuls of water, a tablespoonful every morning, with such cautions as I consider generally advisable for patients at a dis-

tance. No effect whatever. I studied the case afresh, and finally determined upon *Carbo animalis*. I gave two powders of  $\frac{g}{2}$ , one globule in each, to be put into seven tablespoonfuls of water, every morning a tablespoonful. After finishing one powder, she wrote that she felt considerably better; that her head and face were much more comfortable than she had felt them for a long time; that she had scarcely suffered any inconvenience before her catamenia; felt more cheerful, and asked whether she was to take the second powder. I advised her not to do so, but to come up in about a fortnight. When I saw her I was as much surprised as pleased to find her complexion very clear, the expression of her countenance very much improved (a criterion to which I always attach great importance), and most of her symptoms very sensibly diminished. To keep up the action of the medicine gently, I gave *Carbo anim.* 200, prepared through four tumblers, a teaspoonful of the fourth every other morning, for ten days; then *Saccharum* for ten days; then *Carbo anim.*  $\frac{g}{2}$ , in seven tablespoonfuls of water, a tablespoonful every third morning. According to the last report, just received, she is progressing most satisfactorily. I now mean to leave her without any medicine whatever for some months, and then act according to circumstances.

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES LUTHER.

Southwick Crescent, Aug. 8, 1853.

#### ON THE HIGHEST POTENCIES CAPABLE OF PRODUCING AN EXACERBATION OF THE SYMPTOMS.

DR. BENNINGHAUSEN reports the following cases to show that such exacerbation may exist.

1. B., a farmer, who had been affected with a chronic cough for the last seventeen or eighteen years, and who had been abandoned by allopathic physicians as consumptive, consulted me on the 9th of July, 1842. In looking over the record which I took of this case, I find it accompanied with the remark, "appears to be a hopeless case." The expectoration was white, tenacious, sweetish, raw; every coughing fit was preceded by oppression of breathing, and was aggravated by the least motion; obstruction of the nose every morning, a good deal of itching at the anus; sourkrout produces flatulence; improvement in the evening. Gave him every two or three months a dose of *Phosph.*, *Sulph.*, *Iod.*, *Ara.*, *Lyc.* (the latter on account of a fungus of the knee, which disappeared), *Sep.*, *Natr. mur.*, all these remedies being administered in the 30th potency, two pellets at a dose, some remedies being given twice, *Phosphorus* three times;

but all that these remedies did was to keep him alive. Towards the end of September, 1844, the disease seemed to grow upon him. I gave him *Phosph.* 200, two pellets in a tumblerful of water, to take a teaspoonful every evening. After the third dose, the symptoms became so violent that the relatives expected his death at every moment. The medicine was stopped, *Sugar of Milk* being substituted. A gradual improvement set in; and in six weeks this patient, who had been abandoned as incurable, had recovered perfect health, and is now one of the most robust and healthy individuals of our district.

2. On the 23d of May, 1840, a robust young Hanoverian, aged twenty-three, applied to me for relief from epileptic fits; which he had had for five years past. They were preceded by shaking, contraction of the left arm, and loss of consciousness, afterwards headache and bilious vomiting. In his healthy period he was frequently attacked with vomiting after eating carrots, sourkrout, beans, &c. Took *Sulph.* 30, two doses of *Calc.* 30, separated by *Lycop.* 30. The attacks ceased until October, when he was attacked with a sort of nervous fever, which was treated allopathically, owing to the great distance of the patient's residence from my own. Afterwards he took *Calc.* 30, which suppressed the fits until April 17, 1841, when he took spirituous drinks, which brought back the fits. They were again suppressed for six months by *Agaricus* 30, and *Calc.* 30. Every five or six months the patient's health was disturbed, and he had to take either *Calc.* or *Silic.* On the 30th of March, 1844, he took a dose of *Silic.* 200, after which he had several violent fits daily, for eight days in succession, and especially bad in the night; but after that lapse of time they ceased, and have never returned since until this day.

It has been supposed that the lower potencies are preferable to the higher in the treatment of acute diseases. I have never seen this doctrine confirmed by experience, and the following cases show the contrary to be true.

1. Mrs. W., aged thirty-eight, whom I had cured of a chronic headache, with closing of both eyes, by *Sepia*, was attacked with a violent and excessively painful inflammation of the left mamma. Took one teaspoonful of a solution of *Phosph.* 400, in a tumblerful of water; was completely cured in forty-eight hours.

2. Mrs. H., wife of a high public functionary, had suffered for some weeks past from a violent face-ache, which had become intolerable under allopathic treatment. It corresponded to *Spigelia*. The lady being extremely sensitive, I caused *Spigel.* 200 to be dissolved in a cupful of water; had one teaspoonful of that solution mixed in a second cupful of water, and directed the patient to

take one teaspoonful of this latter solution. The effect of this dose was violent, in spite of my precaution. Immediately after taking the dose, she had an attack of the pain, which was more violent than any of the preceding ones had been. This attack lasted only five minutes; it then ceased altogether, and the pain has never returned since.

3. Mrs. F., daughter and sister of two counsellors in medicine (an honorary title in Germany), who were by no means favorable to Homœopathy, was attacked three months ago with tearing face-ache and toothache. The pain became so severe under allopathic treatment, that the father swallowed the bitter pill and consulted me on the subject. *Bryonia* was the remedy. The patient took *Bry.* 200, to be prepared as in the former case. But it appears that the allopathic brain of the father got bewildered by the apparent nothingness of the dose, and he therefore determined to give his daughter a teaspoonful of the first solution, not mixing it in a second tumblerful. Ten minutes after taking, the dose the husband came to me in great consternation, and informed me that his wife was much worse, and this aggravation was probably owing to the medicine having been given out of the first tumbler. Gave *Sugar of Milk*. Next morning, the husband called again, telling me that the aggravation had speedily subsided, that the patient had had a comfortable night's rest, and that the pain had entirely disappeared. The patient remained well.

#### ADVANTAGES OF THE HOMŒOPATHIC RULES.

WM. HENDERSON, M. D., Professor of General Pathology in the University of Edinburgh, has written and published an answer to Dr. SIMPSON on Hahnemann and Homœopathy. We have not yet received the book, but a few extracts we find in the Homœopathic Times, one of which is as follows:

"The principal, if not the only, dispute between us and the more intelligent of our opponents, in so far as the *law* is concerned, is simply this,—that we, with the help of our provings, make the homœopathic law the *rule* by which we select the medicines we prescribe, giving such medicines only as we know from the proving to be capable of *producing* symptoms and morbid conditions similar to those existing in the diseases which we are called upon to treat; while they (our opponents) do not *act upon* the homœopathic law as a rule in the prescribing of drugs, though they *admit the fact* of a homœopathic relation subsisting between certain diseases and the operations of the medicines which cure them. Our procedure gives us an immense advantage over our op-

ponents, even in the employment of the very medicines which both of us use in diseases which to appearance are the same. For instance, they use *Ipecacuan.*, and also *Mercury*, in dysentery; we do so likewise, but with this great superiority over them, that our rule directs us to the employment of *Ipecacuan.*, where *Ipecacuan.* is likely to be the most suitable and successful remedy, and of *Mercury*, where it is more likely to succeed; for all cases of dysentery are neither exactly similar in every respect, nor curable by the same remedy. Our opponents cannot adapt either of these medicines with any degree of precision or certainty to the different cases for which they are respectively suitable; and when they do give the right remedy in the right case, it is simply and solely by chance,—for what they call the indications which seem to make it advisable that one of the medicines should be given in preference to the other, are mere matters of opinion or hypotheses, on which there is no general agreement, and for which no valid reason can be adduced. The illustration I have just adverted to is, perhaps, the most favorable to the allopathic party that can be given, when there is any room for doubt as to what medicine is proper for a particular case of disease. In most of the instances in which, speaking in a general way, we employ the same remedies, their difficulties in fixing upon the right medicine for the right case are vastly increased by the choice lying among several or many. They have no rule to guide them, with the exception of that misnamed experience which proceeds on the resemblance, in some of its chief characters, of the case under treatment, to one which had formerly been treated with success by a certain remedy. This rule is loose and uncertain as a guide to practice, because it never can descend sufficiently to particulars,—because two cases of the same disease, which agree in a few prominent features, may, and very often do, differ materially in their special characters, and in what they want in order to be successfully treated. On this subject Dr. Abercrombie makes the following judicious reflections, and I suppose his authority will hardly be rejected:—‘When, in the practice of medicine, we apply to new cases the knowledge acquired from others which we believe to have been of the same nature, the difficulties are so great, that it is doubtful whether in any case we can properly be said to act upon experience, as we do in other departments of science. For we have not the means of determining with certainty that the condition of the disease, the habit of the patient, and all the circumstances which enter into the character of the affection, are in any two cases precisely the same; and if they differ in any one particular, we cannot be said to act from experience, but only from analogy. The difficulties and sources of uncertainty

which meet us at every stage of such investigations are, in fact, so great and so numerous, that those who have had the most extensive opportunities of observation will be the first to acknowledge that our pretended experience must, in general, sink into analogy, and even our analogy too often into conjecture.’\* Homœopathy saves its disciples from most of the doubts and difficulties which perplex the allopathic physician (I use the term merely for the sake of distinction, for when employing specifics he is not an allopath, whatever he may think himself to be); they have provings of so many medicines, so minutely and carefully detailed, that they have usually no difficulty in fixing upon the medicine which, of all that are known, is the most suitable to each particular case of disease. Difficulties, however, even homœopaths sometimes have in selecting a remedy for some peculiar case; for many medicines are yet but imperfectly proved, and many more, doubtless, exist in nature which have not hitherto been proved at all, and among which, it may be, the most appropriate homœopathic remedy for such peculiar case exists, though as yet unavailable, because unproved. Two instances occur to me which illustrate both this observation and the practical advantages of the homœopathic rule. In the August number of the *Monthly Journal of Medical Science* for 1853, Dr. Simpson published a case of headache in a female, which, after having been unsuccessfully treated by many physicians, homœopathic and allopathic, yielded to the sulphate of nickel, with which Dr. Simpson was making experiments at the time. Supposing—as may possibly have been the case, though one instance is not by any means a proof that it was so—that the headache ceased in consequence of the employment of the sulphate of nickel, we have here an illustration of the specific operation of a remedy, and consequently of its homœopathic operation, for we have no evidence that any specific remedy is other than homœopathic, and a great mass of evidence that the so-called specifics are in reality homœopathic remedies. There is as yet no homœopathic proving of the sulphate of nickel, though there is of the carbonate, but not of a very full and detailed description. Now, if the sulphate of nickel was the proper homœopathic remedy for this case, no homœopathic physician could cure it; he had no proving to guide him, and he has no other guide that he can trust to in selecting a remedy in such a case. How, then, did Dr. Simpson hit upon the sulphate of nickel as the remedy for this headache? What rule or principle had he to guide him? How will he proceed in employing the sulphate in other cases of headache? Sulphate of nickel, he says, ‘is a gentle tonic,’ but there are

\* Intellectual Powers, p. 395.



scores of 'gentle tonics;' next, it 'corresponds with the therapeutic action of the salts of iron,' but 'they also specifically differ from each other in some respects,' and the case of headache under consideration 'defied iron in many different forms.' On what special ground, then, was the sulphate of nickel used in this case? It may be safely answered, on none whatever of a higher or more scientific description than this, in Dr. Simpson's words, 'I began making various experiments upon myself and others with different metals,' and because 'it seems, *a priori*, highly probable that some of the new, like some of the old, metals will turn out to have decided, and it may be important therapeutic properties.' Without any clear notion of the actual therapeutic powers of these metals, at best with the expectation that they would be found to resemble in their actions other metals which had been accidentally ascertained or theoretically imagined to possess certain medicinal properties, Dr. Simpson experimented at random on one case after another, until *accidentally* an instance of headache fell in his way that yielded to the specific virtues of the sulphate of nickel! There was obviously no rational scientific principle to direct the experiments; and even now, after a case has been happily fallen in with which was cured by the drug, neither Dr. Simpson nor any of his party can give the smallest inkling of a reason why the medicine succeeded, or the slightest appearance of a *rule* for its future successful employment. Try iron, or cadmium, or iridium, or tellurium, or zinc, or quinine, or nickel, or anything, in headaches, and now and then a case will cast up which one of these drugs will cure. No one denies this, and no one will deny that a standing clock will tell the exact time twice in a day, for every hour of the day glides twice past the face of the motionless machine. The medical system which accidentally succeeds in its unregulated career is just as worthy of confidence as the stirless timepiece; and its instance or two of occasional cures of the kind under consideration are no more entitled to be regarded as proofs of its scientific efficiency, than the perfect exactness with which the stockstill handles of the clock, set at the figures 12, will daily coincide with the solar noon, is entitled to be regarded as a proof of the mechanical excellence of the timepiece."

#### LETTER FROM NEW ORLEANS.

[From the Louisville Democrat.]

NEW ORLEANS, Aug. 9th, 1853.

*Messrs. Editors:*—I sit down to record the progress of the epidemic, which has now attained a very sad growth indeed. The weather continues variable, but with less rain and more heat; and people are dying at the

rate of sixteen hundred a week. The perpetual panorama of hearses and coffins in the day-time, and of lighted windows at night, exceeds anything I ever witnessed. I hope never to see the like again.

The very noteworthy fact is developed by the present epidemic, that *yellow fever yields to homœopathy more readily than to any other practice*. There are several of these physicians here, who have had and have now plenty of cases on hand, and I have not heard of their losing a single case; had they lost one, I am sure their enemies, the allopathists, would have trumped it to the city's ends. In a boarding-house on Poydras street, where two negroes were attacked with the fever, an experiment was made between the two modes of treatment. They were afraid of Homœopathy, however, and put the most valuable slave, a \$1200 man, in the allopathist's hands; and they lost him. The other slave, being an old and valueless woman, was consigned to the homœopathist's care, and he cured her. In another house, where five were stricken down, an allopathist lost the first three; a homœopathist was then sent for, who saved the other two. I get this intelligence from better sources than the doctors themselves, and think it worth making a note of. I may add, that the homœopathists at first were engaged only as last resorts, when other physicians could not be had instantly; consequently their success has been a matter equally of surprise to the public and of triumph to themselves, which they bear very modestly. If it were not for those mysterious little doses, *given solely and alone*, I believe Homœopathy would thrive better. If its professors would humor skepticism a little—give a *bitter* dose now and then, and bleed or blister occasionally, just by way of sham—they would have more than they could attend to all the time. But no one can comprehend the efficacy of those minute loaf-sugar instalments, and, even if benefited by them, cannot banish their doubts entirely. I confess to this weakness, even while I give it as my firm opinion that there is merit in Homœopathy.

I have seen sights here within the last week, that did not make my hair stand on end, but which caused my nostrils to collapse and my stomach to whirl. In one of my previous letters I complained of the smell of dead dogs; now my complaint is the smell of dead men. I visited the Ridge Cemeteries the other day. The sight of trench-burial and the smell of rotten corpses was more than I bargained for, and I came home sickened and disgusted. The affair of the Lafayette Cemetery (an account of which I published in the Delta) stands without a parallel in modern times. I have a thousand incidents of interest connected with the epidemic to relate, but must postpone them for the present. The faces of beauty, youth, and manly pride that I can recollect meeting

so recently in my daily walks, that are now "mingling with their kindred dust," are perpetually flitting across my imagination—a lesson of mortality that I shall never forget. Think of 250 dying each day in a population of less than seventy thousand—for the city is now more deserted than it has been in fifteen years. A physician of note said last Sunday, he believed there were at that instant more than *ten thousand* cases of yellow fever in the city.

L. G.

There are others beside the author of the above letter, who think, if homœopaths would occasionally yield to ignorance, prejudice, and superstition in the treatment of the sick, and employ allopathic measures, such a course would tend to beget faith in Homœopathy. But experience proves just the contrary. Whenever measures are used in conjunction with homœopathic practice, which are allopathic, if only in appearance, the benefit is sure to be ascribed to Allopathy. We had a case of severe *neuralgia* under treatment, which was yielding to the remedies; but at the period when the medicine was accomplishing its purpose, the patient applied vinegar and water, and he has had no pain since; yet he has no confidence in Homœopathy, but has full faith in vinegar for *neuralgia*. Thus it ever is, where allopathic measures are used.

Homœopathy, pure Homœopathy, that promulgated by Hahnemann in his Organon, has been proved to be the safest and the surest in all diseases; and those who will not examine the evidence which proves the fact here stated, must be left to their fate under allopathic medication; for the practitioner, who is imbued with a love of truth, feels the importance of his mission, and cannot come down to cater for ignorance, prejudice, and superstition by charlatanry.

If there be persons who will not credit the testimony of thousands of educated physicians, whose morals are unimpeachable, that the "small doses" are efficient in the treatment of diseases, as they have proved by years of experience; in such circumstances, it seems to us unpardonable, as well as unreasonable, to attempt to convince such of the truth of Homœopathy by darkening it by any degree of Allopathy; but on the contrary, let Homœopathy appear in her fair proportions, that her beauty may be seen unclouded by Allopathy.

## THE SOCIAL POSITION OF MEDICINE.

### An Inaugural Address,

*Delivered before the Hahnemann Academy of Medicine, January 20th, 1853,*

BY J. A. MCVICKAR, M.D., OF NEW YORK.

THIS address has only come into our hands within a few days, which accounts for this late notice of it.

Our friends occasionally blame us for not noticing addresses, proceedings of societies, books, &c., but the fault is not always with us, for we cannot notice these matters unless we have knowledge of them. Dr. Humphreys delivered an address at Utica, before the State Homœopathic Society, and it was resolved to offer it to us for publication in this Journal, but we have never received the copy. But to return to Dr. McVickar's address. It is well written, and the subject interesting. The Dr. deals some hard blows upon the allopathic school, and pays a just tribute to Hahnemann. We have room for a single extract only, which is the conclusion of the address:

We have seen that the great cause of the want of confidence, on the part of the public toward physicians, has been the imperfection of empirical art. The evil is wide-spread, and we, in common with our brethren, suffer by it. Though, in Homœopathy, medicine has become a true art, and therefore the cause has ceased to exist, its influence remains, and time will be required to recover for legitimate medicine its rightful position. But much may be done to hasten the event, by a very simple and I think reasonable and proper means—and that is, *popular instruction in medicine*.

There is no good reason why medicine should be entirely excluded from the catalogue of popular studies. Popular lectures on mechanics do not set every man to mending his own watch when it needs repairs; on the contrary, the knowledge imparted to him makes him the more careful to avoid tampering with its delicate arrangements, or submitting it to incompetent hands. The preservation of health and the safe treatment of disease are certainly matters of infinitely greater delicacy and importance; the first being of necessity committed to the discretion of each individual, and the proper selection of a medical adviser left to his judgment; yet how incompetent, from lack of knowledge, are a considerable portion of the laity to exercise either in the premises.

Medicine is no mystery, and we can no longer make it appear a mystery if we would; but to many it is practically a nullity. In sickness, it would seem, they must

(from habit or example) do something in the way of treatment, but *what*, they think of little importance. Their idea of means toward a cure is, that it is a chance, and they blindly take of anything that offers. How frequently does it occur that, to the physician's question, "what have you taken for your disease?" the answer is returned, "*something* (pill or mixture, as the case may be) *we had in the house*," in entire ignorance of its composition, whether applicable or injurious.

With an appropriate kind and degree of knowledge, think you a man would trust the repairs of his delicate organism to his own unskilful hand or to that of an ignorant pretender, when he would not commit his watch to the rude manipulations of a blacksmith?

Quackery, which owed its origin to a defective art, owes its protracted existence to popular ignorance in medicine. The age in which we live demands that we should forsake the ancient policies of our craft, and conform to the spirit of the times. The nineteenth century is a great practical fact, which cannot be kept too constantly before the mind in all the concerns of life, but it has a special bearing upon the prospective course of our profession, and particularly of our own institution. As individuals, we are meeting and correcting, day by day, the prevailing medical skepticism; as an institution we owe it to society to act upon the masses.

This evil spirit grows out of that degree of knowledge which enables its possessor to discover faults and apparent inconsistencies in medical practice, but not to weigh and appreciate its difficulties and its merits; while a greater degree would convince them that a regular and systematic education is necessary even to a safe application of remedies to a known disease; whereas, without such education, and much experience and practical acumen, many diseases are undiscoverable, and all are liable to be mistaken and consequently maltreated.

The advanced state of general education has made the public mind familiar with many things which a very few years ago were abstruse, and sealed to all but the few; accordingly it is not only prepared to grapple with anything which is interesting, or can be made practically useful, but it is entirely unprepared to yield a blind submission of the reason to any. If in medicine we desire its confidence, that is attainable, but only by convincing its judgment. If we wish the public to respect the true physician, we must give them such knowledge as will enable them to appreciate him in the intellectual and artistic features of his profession.

Give them the means of thinking for themselves. Let them see that the art of medicine relies upon no faculty of second-sight, intuitive or acquired, by which the qualities of disease can be discerned at a glance; that

it does not sanction a careless application of means scarce shrewdly guessed at; but that the unravelling of disease and its reasonable treatment are processes which demand the exercise of the highest qualities of mind. In other words, we must teach them what the art of medicine is, and what it requires, and we may then safely leave it and the profession to find their own level, confident that our art, founded as it now is on true principles, will yield to none in dignity, and that its practitioners will receive that place in public estimation to which their noble and self-denying labors so well entitle them.

## VETERINARY HOMŒOPATHY.

### *Stray Leaves from my Case-Book.*

BY W. HAYCOCK, V. S. AND M. R. C. V. S.

WEST PARADE, HUDDERSFIELD.

### *Leaf the Third.*

#### CASE 3. CONVULSIONS IN A DOG.

In the month of December, 1849, soon after I had commenced to practically investigate the claims of Homœopathy in its relation to equine disease, a gentleman sent his groom to my place with a Skye-terrier bitch; he carried the animal in a basket, in consequence of her being affected with what he called "a fit." At the time he entered my surgery, the animal was lying in a state of unconsciousness at the bottom of the basket, the limbs were violently contorted, the head was drawn to the left side, the jaws worked convulsively, the mouth was filled with foam, and every now and then she would snatch at some imaginary object. From the groom I gathered the following particulars: He said, twelve or fourteen days since, the bitch was hunting rats, and she dirtied herself very much, and to clean her, the master threw her several times into the canal, and the day after doing so, she was attacked with a fit very similar to the present, only not so violent; that she had continued to have them more or less ever since, and that within the last three or four days the attacks had been more violent than at first. At the time the man was telling me this, I happened to have a bottle of *Hyosciamus* standing upon the counter, and without giving the matter any further thought, I poured three or four drops of the medicine into a spoon, to which I added a little water, and gave it to the animal as she lay in the state as above described, and to my astonishment the bitch in a few minutes recovered as if by magic. Consciousness was restored, and she lay perfectly quiet and easy upon her bed. I directed the man to bring her again the day following; but I did not see him until three or four days after, when he informed me that the bitch had remained free from fits up to that time. He said, "Your drops acted like

a charm." I saw the animal frequently for more than twelve months afterwards, and she never had another attack of the kind. At the time I administered the remedy, I was not aware how completely homœopathic it was to the case; but from the attack disappearing so suddenly, and from its like never again appearing, I was induced to read the provings of *Hyosciamus* as given in Jahr, when I read the following:—"Convulsive movements. The limbs become spasmodically curved, and the curved body is jerked into the air; excessive tossing of the body by convulsions; convulsions with foam at the mouth," and a great many other symptoms bearing equally close upon the case in question, but which it would be superfluous to quote upon the present occasion. I had therefore, by the merest chance, given the remedy which of all others was probably the most homœopathic to the case.

#### CASE 4. RED MANGE.

In the month of July, 1850, I was consulted by a gentleman respecting one of his pointer dogs. The animal, he informed me, was two years of age, that he was a remarkably fine dog, and that for six or eight weeks prior to the period I have named, the animal had manifested what he believed to be the red mange. I carefully examined the case, and found the disease considerably advanced; it was one of the worst cases I had ever seen. Between the thighs of the animal, under the abdomen, and upon the breast and sides, the skin was of a deep, red color, the redness was of about the same hue as a boiled lobster; the dog was restless, was continually scratching his sides, and trailing the abdomen upon the ground, and he was greatly reduced in condition. I prescribed the following as a lotion, a portion of it to be applied to the skin once a day: *Tincture of Arnica*, four drachms; water, one pint, and mixed well together. The following to be administered internally: *Arnica*, three drops of the 1st dilution, in a little water, to be given every morning; also *Sulphur*, three drops of the 6th dilution, mixed with a little water, and given to the animal every night. This treatment was steadily pursued for eight days, at the end of which time the disease was thoroughly eradicated. I have seen the dog many times since, and he was always in good health. During the last two years, I have treated several cases of red mange in dogs, and in all cases in a similar way, and with the same result as above described. Sometimes *Sulphur* of the first trituration, in half-grain doses, proves more beneficial than the dilutions of this remedy; in other cases, again, *Belladonna* and *Phosphorus* will be found of great service. In all cases, however, of this kind, I would recommend the continuance of *Sulphur* for eight or ten days, even after the cure appears to

be perfect, a dose to be given every other day.\*

#### MISREPRESENTATION OF, AND IGNORANCE CONCERNING, HOMŒOPATHY.

BY DR. SHARP, OF LONDON.

THE misrepresentation of Homœopathy by its opponents is a difficulty which I feel great reluctance to notice. Such disingenuous conduct reflects so much discredit upon my professional brethren, that I would it did not exist, or that I had no need to allude to it. Charges, without proof, of quackery, of fraud, and of falsehood; attempts to hinder the circulation of our books; to erase our names from college and other lists, and to refuse diplomas to our students; accompanied at the same time with the unacknowledged adoption of some of our best remedies, betray a state of feeling greatly to be lamented.

The general ignorance, which prevails upon the subject of Homœopathy, is not only a great difficulty in itself, but is also the origin of most of those we have already noticed. Both the profession and the public need to be better informed as to what Homœopathy really is. How few persons have any definite idea of the principle of Homœopathy, and of those who have, the great majority entertain a mistaken notion. They think it teaches that what causes a mischief will cure it, thus confounding *similia* (like) with *idem* (the same). Some of Hahnemann's own illustrations may have tended to foster this mistake; but it is highly desirable that the point at issue should be clearly stated and understood before it is discussed. Many things taken into the stomach, in a state of health, are found by experience to nourish and support the body—to preserve life and health; these are called *food*. Many other things, when similarly taken, are found by experience to cause pain and injury to the body—to destroy health and life; these are called *poisons*. We have also learnt from experience that some of these latter substances,—these poisons—when given in natural disease, act beneficially and remedially upon the diseased body. Homœopathy implies that experience further teaches us that the best mode of administering these remedial poisons, is to give them in such cases of natural ailments as resemble in their symptoms those injurious effects which such poisons produce when taken in health. If a person has suffered a bruise, he is not supposed to require a second blow to cure him, as is often stated, in order apparently to throw ridicule upon the subject, but some substance is to be sought for, which, when taken in health, will produce pains and sensations similar to those of

\* For further particulars, see my "Elements of Veterinary Homœopathy." London: Aylott & Co.



the bruise. A plant called *Arnica Montana* does this, and a small dose of the juice of this plant is found by happy experience, to relieve the pains of the bruise far better than any other remedy yet discovered.

It is objected that the symptoms produced by these poisons, when taken in health, and said to be similar to those symptoms in disease for which they act as remedies, are not invariably produced; for instance, that *Belladonna* does not always produce symptoms resembling scarlet fever, or that *Mercury* does not always produce salivation, or ulceration of the throat. No one ever asserted that they did, nor is it at all required for the truth of Homœopathy that they should. If they have ever unequivocally done so, it proves that they are capable of producing them, which is all that Homœopathy asserts.

Again, on the question of the small dose, we are frequently told that it is putting a grain of the medicine into one end of the Lake of Geneva, and taking a wine-glass out at the other. The North Sea and the Atlantic Ocean are similarly referred to; but such observations only betray the ignorance of those who make them. The medicines for homœopathic use are prepared in a very simple manner. A medicinal plant, when in its perfection, is bruised, and the liquid part separated from the solid; a portion of this liquid is mixed with an equal quantity of pure spirit of wine—this is called the "mother tincture"; two drops of this tincture are mixed with ninety-eight drops of spirit and shaken—this is the first dilution; one drop of this is mixed with ninety-nine drops of spirit and shaken—this is the second dilution; one drop of this is mixed with ninety-nine drops of spirit and shaken—this is the third dilution, and so on for other dilutions. These are sometimes made on the decimal scale, instead of the centesimal, that is, two drops of the mother tincture are mixed with eight drops of spirit, instead of ninety-eight, to form the first decimal dilution; one drop of this with nine drops of spirit to form the second decimal dilution, and so on. But, when not otherwise expressed, the scale of one in the hundred is understood. Solid substances are similarly prepared by rubbing together one grain with ninety-nine grains of sugar of milk. Where there is nothing to conceal, the truth has only to be simply stated. By so doing, the responsibility of rejecting it is thrown upon those who venture to do so, and ignorance itself becomes criminal.

#### ON THE SIZE OF THE DOSE.

It is not always that we can determine the dose which should be given with that accuracy that is desirable; and we will throw out a few hints that may be serviceable.

It is a rule in philosophy, always to determine by actual experiment a new proposition submitted for examination; and we think this has been much neglected of late by homœopaths generally. We allude particularly to the subject of doses; and we have relied too much on theory and our reasonings, and have supposed that we could demonstrate from the received ideas on this subject the practice that should be adopted; forgetting that the dose to be given is peculiarly a subject of experiment.

Having premised thus much, let us examine the results of our experiments on this subject. It may be considered to be an ascertained fact, that patients whose vitality is very low are least affected by the remedy given, that is, the aggravation is less; and *vice versa*, in the patient whose vitality is high, the aggravation is greatest. It has also been observed, that in weak and nervous persons, the expression of the remedy is not as powerful as was expected. The conclusion we draw from these facts is, that we may exhibit a remedy in a larger dose to a patient, where the general tone of the system has been weakened by disease, than to a patient where disease has not as yet affected the system generally, so as to reduce it. Thus, to a patient in the lower stages of typhoid fever, it is right to use the larger dose, and we need not fear aggravation. Whereas, in a patient suffering merely from some local disturbance, a large dose will always produce great aggravation; and thus it is seen in chronic diseases, the smallest doses answer best, for the vitality of the parts are not in general affected, but a disturbance rather of their normal condition; and we would call attention to these facts, and suggest, whether, in some of these cases, where the remedy given has been administered more in proportion to the apparent strength of the patient than to the rule we have laid down, it has not produced mischief, by the violent action the parts affected have been subjected to. The idea we have often heard expressed, of a large dose for that strong man, and a light dose for that debilitated delicate woman, is rather a first thought of the mind than a deduction from experiment.

# PURGATIVES A FREQUENT CAUSE OF CONSTIPATION.

BY WILLIAM MORGAN, SURGEON.

ONE word may here be said on the baneful effects of purgatives. The repeated use of those medicines is now prohibited and condemned by most physicians of the old school;—*the most skeptical acknowledge the general law of nature, that all impressions become less strong by habit and repetition*;—the repeated confessions of the afflicted show that the relief obtained by such means is but temporary, the same symptoms recurring over and over again, and each relapse assuming a more aggravated form. When a patient has an attack of Dyspepsia, Constipation, or often both combined, such as a heavy dull weight, or lump in the stomach, with in an hour or two after meal, with, generally, tumefaction of the abdomen, headache, a giddy, swimming sensation, flatulence, with occasionally bringing up mouthfuls of flatus, sour water, or half-digested food, and also constipation of some days' standing, feeling oppression, with hot, dry skin, and fever, the panacea is the old favorite dose, or whatever else your kind neighbor may recommend.

The medicine is taken; immediate relief follows; the contents of the bowels—viz., half-digested food, wind, and acid liquor;—are all carried away, as if by magic; the headache abates; the skin becomes moist; in fact, a sensation of ease and comfort diffuses itself through the whole frame. Such are, I may say, the magical effects of purgatives in those disorders. But what is the result of the repeated use of such means? It is true, it clears out the contents of the alimentary canal, but unfortunately carries with it also that portion of aliment which, if allowed to remain, would become digested and assimilated. It over-emulges the liver, pancreas, and secreting ducts, studding the vast extent of the intestinal canal, causing those organs to throw out their valuable contents in too large a quantity, thereby producing general debility. It destroys the natural functions of the stomach and alimentary canal, and produces nausea, sickness, vomiting, griping, and even syncope, with, at times, bloody and slimy stools. It disturbs the brain, and lowers the vital energy, producing, at times, lowness of spirits, with

hypochondriasis; at other times, great mental excitement, with peculiar irritability of temper; and lastly, it destroys that beautiful and delicate membrane that lines the intestinal canal, producing inflammation, and, sooner or later, ulceration of its surface, followed by dysentery, when death steps in, and closes a long and painful scene.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

DEAR DOCTOR,—*Eclectic* Homœopathy at the present time is quite prevalent in this region of country (Ohio and Indiana). There is no doubt of the fact that it originated at the time Dr. Rosa delivered his course of lectures at the Eclectic Institute in Cincinnati. His lectures in themselves were well enough, and undoubtedly did accomplish some good for our cause; but I do not believe there is an individual graduate of the Institute at that period who is now exclusively and entirely a Homœopathist. They practise a mixture of Allopathy, or Eclecticism, as it is sometimes called. They call themselves homœopathists, however, and Homœopathy, as far as their influence extends, is obliged to father all their other pathies and imms.

Yours, &c.,

R. W.

LEXINGTON, KY., May 25th, 1853.

DEAR DR. KIRBY :

Please send me 20 copies of the *American Journal of Homœopathy*, Vol. 8. I would not do without your journal, if it would cost three times as much as it does; for I consider it the truest exponent of pure genuine Homœopathy; indeed, it is like a green spot in the desert. What you say in reference to Hahnemann's Organon is only too true, for I am well aware that there are many, who call themselves homœopathists, who do not possess that valuable book, yea, and who never read it neither. It is inexplicable to me, how a man can pretend to be a homœopath, and yet not possess, read, and study that great book, where so much valuable information is to be found which is of the utmost importance to be a successful homœopathic practitioner.

This state of things, I am pretty certain, is to some extent attributed to that unfor-

fortunate declaration of Dr. C. Hering, in his preface to the third American edition of the *Organon*, where he says: "For myself, I am generally considered as a disciple and adherent of Hahnemann, and I do indeed declare that I am one among the most enthusiastic in doing homage to his greatness; but nevertheless I declare also, that since my first acquaintance with Homœopathy (1821) down to the present day, I have never yet accepted a single theory in the *Organon*, as it is there promulgated." This, to be sure, is all very well, if it were generally understood as Hering meant it; but that this is not the case, I am practically convinced; for I have heard some say, that no one will doubt but that Hering is a homœopath, and yet does not believe in the *Organon*. Men like Hering ought to be very cautious how they express themselves. But what kind of homœopaths are those that care so little for the *Organon*. I do most positively declare, that I have to see the first one yet, that does deserve to be called a homœopath at all; for they are nothing but Eclectics, using anything and everything, are generally unsuccessful, and are, therefore, doing great injury to the system they profess to practice. To me the *Organon* is of inestimable value. I have read it often, still read it, and study it, and it always seems to me I learn more from it, let me read it ever so often.—I tell you all this to show you that the course you pursue in your valuable journal is the right one; for, as it is only pure genuine Homœopathy that is successful in practice, it is of course highly necessary for homœopathic journalists to inform the public what is Homœopathy, and what is Eclecticism. I am sorry to say that I sincerely believe, that one-half of the homœopaths out here in the West belong to the latter class.—There are many warm friends of our system in this city, and by spreading your valuable journal among them I hope to bring over a good many more. Go on, as independently as you have done this seven years, and your reward will be sure to follow you, for all true followers of the great master are with you.

Yours truly,

C. EHLMANN, M. D.

#### HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THE sixth Annual Announcement is upon our table. We notice a change in the faculty. Dr. Frederick Humphreys takes the place of Dr. William S. Helmuth, on Homœopathic Institutes, Pathology, and the Practice of Medicine. Jacob Beakley, M.D., takes the chair of Surgery, in place of Dr. Francis Sims. We have the honor of a personal acquaintance with both of these new professors, and we know them to be "apt to teach," and we do not doubt they will discharge their duties to the satisfaction of the students, and all interested in the college.

We understand there is a prospect of a large increase of the class the next session.

#### BOOK NOTICES.

*Homœopathic Domestic Practice*, by EGBERT GUERNSEY, M.D., octavo, pp. 588. Wm. Radde, New-York, 1853.

THE cursory examination we have given this work has not enabled us to find anything of value, differing from other works of its class. Dr. Guernsey has done as well as those who have gone before him, and his book, for aught we know, may teach just as much quackery in Homœopathy as the rest of the numerous works on Domestic Practice; for, generally speaking, to prescribe homœopathically by any one of them, except by accident, is out of the question. If intelligent laymen, in the absence of a physician, in cases of emergency, must prescribe, why not recommend to them *Jahr's Manual and Repertory*? they would be more likely to select the remedy than they would by any of these "Domestic" works; for that which is at all useful in practice in the works under notice, is the imperfect repertory part of them.

It is not our intention to condemn Dr. Guernsey's book, and exclude Hering's, Pulte's, Laurie's, and some dozen others, but we condemn the whole of them, as not only useless, but pernicious. A true knowledge of homœopathic practice is not taught by them, nor can any one arrange a work for practical purposes, unless he copies the entire *Materia Medica*.

We suppose, of the making of books there will be no end, and therefore we suggest to

the gentlemen, if they would be really useful to their fellow creatures, and feel it to be their mission to write books for "Domestic Practice," to take up the *Materia Medica*, and rid it of all its technicalities, especially those introduced by Nonck and Trinks, and then describe disease with accuracy, and point out how it affects the human system, and more than all, describe the parts and their condition, which certain symptoms indicate as affected, and thus, with the *Materia Medica* in the plainest language, the layman may prescribe with a fair prospect of success in many diseases. But even with this, we doubt the propriety of recommending laymen to administer medicine to those afflicted, as these works do, with *phthisis pulmonalis*, *malignant scarlet fever*, *typhus fever*, *bilious fever*, *carcinoma*, *angina pectoris*, and all the wide range of chronic diseases, which require all the acumen, and nice discrimination, which experience and constant practice alone can give.

*Hartmann's Diseases of Children.* Translated by Dr. HEMPEL.

*A Treatise on Apoplexy*, by JNO. C. PETERS, M.D.

*A Treatise on Diseases of Females*, by JNO. C. PETERS, M.D.

*Complete Repertory of the Homœopathic Materia Medica*, by CHARLES J. HEMPEL, M.D.

These works are all published by Wm. Radde, New-York.

*Typhoid Fever*, and its Homœopathic Treatment, by AUG. RAPOU, translated by M. COTÉ, M.D., and published by Moore, Anderson & Company, Cincinnati.

We shall express our opinion of the above works hereafter.

The *Medical Gazette* is again at its dirty work of libelling homœopathists. The editor of that print is not a wise man, or he would know that unjust personalities do not promote the spread of truth, nor retard the progress of error. And further, he should know that Homœopathy is established, and has a fixed position as a system of medicine, which cannot be disturbed by defaming its practitioners, nor by misrepresenting the system itself.

*The Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy*, edited by William A. Gardiner, M. D., for July and August, is received. This periodical is ably conducted. It takes the Hahnemannian platform, and defends Homœopathy with ability. It is no mongrel; we wish we could say as much of some other publications that reach our table, which, we regret to say, should not take the name of Hahnemann and Homœopathy in their allopathic polluted lips.

**Woman's Medical Guide**, containing Essays on the Physical, Moral and Educational Development of Females, and the Homœopathic treatment of their diseases in all periods of life, by J. H. PULTE, M. D., Professor of Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children, in the Western College of Homœopathy, &c. Price \$1.

**Typhoid Fever** and its Homœopathic treatment, by AUG. RAPOU, Docteur en Médecine de la Faculté de Paris, translated by M. COTÉ, M. D. Price 50 cents.

**Homœopathic Domestic Physician.** Fourth edition. By J. H. PULTE, M. D. Price \$1.50.

**Homœopathic Manual of Obstetrics**, by Dr. C. Croserio, translated from the French by M. COTÉ, M. D. Price 75 cents.

**A Treatise on Headaches**, based on Th. J. Rückert's Clinical Experience in Homœopathy, by John C. Peters, M. D. Price 75c.

**A Treatise on Apoplexy**, with an Appendix on Softening of the Brain and Paralysis, based on Th. J. Rückert's Clinical Experience in Homœopathy, by John C. Peters, M. D. Price 75 cents.

**HOMŒOPATHIC DOMESTIC MEDICINE**, by J. LAURIE, M. D. Sixth American edition, enlarged and improved, by A. Gerald Hull, M. D. Price \$1.50.

**HOMŒOPATHIC DOMESTIC PRACTICE**, by Albert Guernsey, M. D. Price \$1.50.

For sale at

**Smith's Homœopathic Pharmacy**,  
488 Broadway, New York,

Where may be had also, a general assortment of Homœopathic Medicines, Pocket and other Cases, Sugar of Milk, pure Alcohol, &c., &c., &c.

**AGENTS FOR THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.**

OTIS CLAPP, Boston, Mass.

MATTHEW & HOWARD, 129 South Eighth Street, Phila., Pa.

Dr. J. M. PARKS, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dr. W. E. FREEMAN, Wilmington, North Carolina.